

REMARKS

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

In the Office Action dated May 5, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5-7, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schnipelsky et al. (U.S. 5,229,297). The Examiner further rejected claims 1, 3-22, 26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mian et al. (U.S. 6,319,469).

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9-11, 16, 17, and 28 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cathey et al. (U.S. 5,399,486) in view of Mian.

Without acquiescing to the asserted grounds of rejection, Applicants have cancelled the rejected claims for filing in a divisional application.

The pending claims are allowable

The Official Action states that claims 23-25 and 27 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form containing the limitations of all the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended the claims in conformity with these suggestions and respectfully contend that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully contend that all conditions of patentability have been met, and request that all of the rejections of the pending claims 1-29 be

withdrawn.

Applicants hereby earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance. If for any reason, the application is not considered to be in condition for allowance on the next Office Action and an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Dated: April 29, 2005

By: _____

Kevin E. Noonan
Reg. No. 35,303

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone No. 312-913-0001
Facsimile No. 312-913-0002